Last Modified	Nōnahea i Whakarerekē	April 2024
Next Review Date	Rā Arotake	April 2028
Approval Authority	Mana Whakaae	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Contact Officer	Āpiha Whakapā	Dean (Academic Governance)

Introduction | Kupu Whakataki

This policy outlines the requirements for undertaking reviews of academic qualifications and programmes.

Policy Statement | Kaupapa Here

Academic Reviews are a key element in the University's Academic Quality Framework. Academic reviews are carried out to ensure that our qualifications meet the expectations of the type of qualification awarded within requirements set by the University and that it meets national and international standards. Academic Reviews therefore provide the institution the opportunity to benchmark its academic offerings and look at areas for enhancement and continuous improvement which could include suggested changes in the curriculum or delivery methods.

The initial focus of a review is on outcomes, i.e., does the qualification meet expected and relevant standards? Review panels consider whether the programme has sufficient staffing, physical resources, and enrolments to achieve the desired academic outcomes.

Additionally, a review might explore systems and processes, especially where it is considered that there is a weakness or gap in an outcome. The review report can identify the processes which need to be addressed in order to achieve the standard alongside any recommended improvements, and suggest steps for achieving these.

Academic review panels are governed by the terms of reference for the review and must be cognisant of the opportunities and the constraints within which the programme or unit under review is operating when making recommendations.

Classification: In-Confidence

Definitions | Tautuhinga

Academic Review – a review of the overall academic quality of a qualification or programme or academic unit, its purpose, structure, curriculum, teaching and learning, student outcomes, and, for undergraduate qualifications in particular, the ability of graduates to meet the UC graduate attributes.

Programme – in the context of 'Academic Review', this is a qualification, or a progressive series of courses in a defined subject or set of subjects. The key characteristic of a 'programme' is that it is comprised of a group of courses that are connected and exhibit a progressive sequence of study.

Qualification – a degree, certificate or diploma, approved by Universities NZ through the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP).

Types and Key Requirements of Academic Reviews

Graduating Year Review (GYR)

CUAP requires a follow-up programme review of all successful proposals involving the introduction of new qualifications, and major subjects and endorsements comprising 40% or more of a qualification. CUAP requires that these are submitted in time for the October meeting of CUAP, i.e. by 1 October, within three years of the graduation of the first cohort of students.

A GYR review report has a very structured format and is limited to four pages (excluding appendices). Where qualifications are introduced as a group, one GYR may cover all clusters of qualifications that were approved at the same time and one extra page per qualification is allowed.

Completed GYRs should be sent to the Executive Dean or delegate, considered by Faculty Board, and sent to AAC before being considered by Academic Board on or before the August Academic Board meeting. From Academic Board they will be sent through to CUAP.

Failure to provide CUAP with a GYR report when requested may result in the suspension of the qualification, resulting in no enrolments into that qualification being able to be processed until the GYR has been received by CUAP and have lifted the suspension.

Programme Reviews

All qualifications of the University shall be reviewed via an academic review. Other than doctorates, these reviews will be commissioned by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) no more than seven years apart. Review reports shall be made to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). The review schedule will be published on the Academic Quality Team's Blue Book Intranet site.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) shall commission a review of the doctorates every 10 years.

Completed Programme Reviews should be sent by the panel chair to the Executive Dean or delegate, and considered by Faculty Board and the Faculty Leadership Team, which will approve an action plan in response to the recommendations. The panel report and responses are then considered by AAC and LTC before being reported to Academic Board. Programme reviews form part of the portfolio of evidence for UC AQA Audit but are not sent to CUAP.

A "One-Year-On Report" will be required 12 months from the report being considered by Academic Board, providing an update on the progress that has been made in response to the panel's recommendations, unless a qualification is in the process of being phased out (subject to DVCA approval). This update should be considered by Faculty Board before being sent to AAC and reported to Academic Board.

Ad Hoc Reviews

Ad Hoc Reviews may be in response to a specific issue and often will focus on a particular academic unit (e.g. reviewing the unit's structure, management, resources, policies, teaching, research), or examining the ongoing viability of a given programme, or for other strategic reasons. Such reviews may be commissioned by the:

- Vice-Chancellor,
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic),
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), or
- Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty.

The process for these reviews can be customised to the scope of the review.

The reporting of the outcomes from an Ad Hoc Review is at the discretion of the person who commissioned the review.

Professional Accreditation Reviews

A number of qualifications have regular reviews required by a professional body for the purposes of assuring that graduates of a qualification receive professional recognition, e.g., an Engineering New Zealand review. Terms of reference for a Professional Accreditation Review are normally set by the relevant professional body. A scheduled Programme Review should be undertaken in conjunction with an Accreditation Review.

Responsibilities for the Management of the Review

Faculty

The costs of academic reviews will be borne by the Faculty responsible for the qualification and/or area. Costs include:
- An honorarium (determined by the Executive Dean) paid to panel members who are not a continuing academic staff member at the University.
- Reasonable travel and accommodation expenses will be arranged or reimbursed.
- Refreshments and meals for the panel.

Executive Dean

Executive Deans may delegate responsibility for the direct management of the review to another faculty member, such as the Associate Dean (Academic).

For Programme Reviews and Ad Hoc Reviews, the Executive Dean or delegate will draft the terms of reference for the review and provide a list of potential panel members. The terms of reference and panel members need to be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). For Professional Accreditation Reviews, if procedures for drafting the terms of reference and/or determining panel membership have not been established by the relevant professional body, the Executive Dean or delegate will draft the terms of reference and provide a list of potential panel members.

For Graduating Year Reviews, the Executive Dean or delegate will approve the panel membership. Terms of reference for GYRs are fixed and are outlined in the GYR handbook.

The Executive Dean or delegate will be responsible for responding to each of the recommendations of the review once the review is completed.

Academic Services Manager

Reviews will be coordinated by an Academic Services Manager or equivalent staff member as directed by the relevant Executive Dean and/or Associate Dean (Academic).

The Academic Services Manager will be responsible for:
- coordinating the review schedule and ensuring the appropriate academic staff and students have been invited to relevant sessions.
- collating a review portfolio which contains relevant documentation.
- ensuring that appropriate administrative support is provided for the review panel.
- ensuring appropriate travel and accommodation is provided for visiting panellist.
- ensuring appropriate refreshments and meals are provided for the panel.

Chair of the Review Panel

The Chair of the Review Panel (or 'Panel Chair') will be responsible for facilitating the review by the panel and for preparing the review report.

When a Programme Review is held in conjunction with a Professional Accreditation Review, this role may be split between the Panel Chair of the Professional Accreditation Review and an additional University of Canterbury Panel Chair who will be responsible for preparing an appendix to cover any internal matters required of a Programme Review that are not covered by the Professional Accreditation Review report.

The Panel Chair should bring to the attention of the Executive Dean, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and/or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) any matters of concern which arise in the review but fall outside the terms of reference. Such matters should not be included in the final review report, which should be restricted to only items under the terms of reference.

Classification: In-Confidence

Panel Members

Panel members will be responsible for participating in the review visit, including reading the review portfolio, meeting with staff and students, and contributing to the development of the report and its recommendations in accordance with the terms of reference. Members must also treat all submissions as confidential.

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

The DVCA approves the terms of reference for the review, including the membership of panels, for Ad Hoc Reviews (when commissioned by the DVCA) and Programme Reviews (other than reviews of doctoral degrees).

The DVCR approves the terms of reference for the review, including the membership of panels, for Ad Hoc Reviews (when commissioned by the DVCR) and Programme Reviews of doctoral degrees.

Academic Quality Team

The Academic Quality Team will notify relevant parties when a review is due to take place and when a one-year-on report is due, and may provide assistance with other matters (e.g. data collection, graduate profiles). Completed panel reports and action lists should be submitted to the Academic Quality Team for inclusion on the AAC/LTC and Academic Board agenda and subsequent archiving.

Procedures

The procedures and processes for each type of review are outlined in the associated review handbook.

Reporting, Archiving and Privacy Requirements

The reporting requirements for each type of review are outlined in the associated handbook. In summary:
- Graduating Year Reviews are considered by the Academic Administration Committee (AAC) and Academic Board before being sent to CUAP. Graduating Year Reviews for qualifications including a thesis of at least 90 points are also considered by the Graduate Research Committee.
- Programme Reviews (and any associated Professional Accreditation Reviews conducted alongside these programme reviews) are considered by AAC and the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) before being sent to Academic Board for approval. Programme Reviews for qualifications including a thesis of at least 90 points are also considered by the Graduate Research Committee.
- The distribution of Ad Hoc Reviews to any appropriate committees is at the discretion of the initiator of the review.

Graduating Year Reviews and Programme Reviews will be archived on appropriate intranet sites by the Academic Quality Team. It is the responsibility of the initiator of an Ad Hoc

Classification: In-Confidence

Review to ensure the Ad Hoc Review Reports are appropriately stored on UC's IT infrastructure for future reference.

Submissions made directly to a review panel must be destroyed once the review report has been finalised. This will be the responsibility of any person receiving such information as part of the review.

Related Documents and Information | He kōrero anō

Review Handbooks

- [Graduating Year Reviews Handbook](#)

- [Programme Reviews Handbook (includes Accreditation Reviews)](#)

- [Ad Hoc Reviews Handbook](#)

UC Website and Intranet | Te Pae Tukutuku me te Ipurangiroto o UC

- [Academic Programme Reviews (Intranet – Staff only)](#)

- [Graduating Year Reviews (Intranet - Staff only)](#)

- [Blue Book Programme Approval (Intranet - Staff Only)](#)

- [Graduate Profiles (Intranet - Staff only)](#)

- [Rautaki Whakawhanake Kaupapa Māori: Strategy for Māori Development (University Plans website)](#)

- [UC Pasifika Strategy 2019-2023 (University Plans website)](#)

- [University of Canterbury Calendar (University Publications website)](#)

External | Mōwaho

- [Universities New Zealand – Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) (Universities New Zealand website)](#)

This policy remains in force until it is updated.

Document History and Version Control			
Version	**Action**	**Approval Authority**	**Action Date**
For document history and versioning prior to 2013 contact ucpolicy@canterbury.ac.nz			
v 1.00	Conversion of document into new format and document pushed out.	Policy Unit	Aug 2013
v 1.01	AVC(A) changed to DVC(A) in line with title change.	Policy Unit	Oct 2013
v 1.02	Document review date pushed out, and DVC(A) changed to DVC(A&I) in line with title change.	Policy Unit	Feb 2014
v 1.03	Hyperlinks updated.	Policy Unit	Jun 2014
v 1.04	Review date pushed out.	Policy Unit	Sep 2014

Classification: In-Confidence

v 1.05	Contact Officer updated and DVC(A&I) changed to DVC(A) in line with title change.	Policy Unit	Apr 2015
v 2.00	Major scheduled review – comprehensive consultation and update.	DVC(A)	Jan 2016
v 2.01	'Faculty' references removed to reflect College-Faculty merger.	Policy Unit	Jun 2016
v 3.00	Scheduled review by Contact Officer, minor changes to position titles and content to reflect current practice.	DVC(A)	Jul 2020
v 4.00	Scheduled review by Contact Officer, major restructure of the document. Introduction of associated Review Handbooks.	DVC(A)	Apr 2024
v 4.01	Minor correction	DVC(A)	Jul 2025

Classification: In-Confidence